

REMARKS

Interview Summary

An Examiner Interview was conducted between Examiner Christopher Peterson, his supervisor and the applicants' representative, Katrina Lyon, on February 20, 2008. Proposed claim amendments faxed previously (February 19, 2008) were discussed. It was discussed that the proposed claim amendments included the proposal to amend the independent claims to include the limitations of allowed claim 22. The Examiner agreed that this would overcome the cited art to date. Some other claim objections and drawing objections were also discussed. The applicant's representative agreed to make the proposed claim changes and to address the claim objections and drawing objection in an After Final Amendment. This After Final Amendment addresses the changes discussed in the Interview.

A. Claim Objections

Claim 1 was objected to because the claim cited "the tilt angle of the lens with respect to the sensor". The Examiner contended that "the tilt angle of the lens with respect to a sensor" should be "a tilt angle of a lens with respect to a sensor". The applicants believe that the original language of Claim 1 is proper in that it is inherent that a camera have a lens and a sensor. However, in order to speed prosecution, the applicants have amended this claim language as requested by the Examiner.

Claim 2 was objected to because the claim cited "a single view camera", and it was contended it should read "the single view camera". Claim 2 has been cancelled so that this objection is moot.

B. Drawings

The drawings were objected to because they do not show the lens. The Office Action stated that the lens must be shown in the figures or be cancelled from

the claims. The applicants have amended FIG. 3 to show the lens. This is not new matter as the lens is discussed in the specification with respect to FIG. 3. It is believed that this amendment overcomes the objection to the drawings.

C. The 35 USC 102(e) Rejection of Claims 1, 3, 15 and 25.

Claims 1, 3, 15 and 25 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Shigehiro et al. (JP 08-108689), herein after referred to as Shigehiro. It was contended in the above-identified Office Action that Shigehiro teaches all the elements of the rejected claims. The applicants respectfully traverse this contention of anticipation.

The applicants have amended Claims 1, 23 and 25 to include the limitations of allowed claim 22. Claim 15 was amended to include the limitations of allowable Claim 18. These changes were made to speed prosecution. No admission is made that the original claims were anticipated or obvious in light of the cited art. It is believed that this amendment overcomes the cited rejection of Claims 1, 3, 15 and 25 over Shigehiro. It is, therefore, respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 1, 3, 15 and 25 be reconsidered based on the exemplary novel claim language:

“wherein the in focus uniform resolution image of said entire whiteboard is captured by
inputting the parameters of the whiteboard comprising whiteboard width, whiteboard height, the height of the whiteboard as imaged by the single view camera, the horizontal distance between the whiteboard and the center of projection of the single view camera, the height of the image sensor, and vertical distance between the center of projection of the single view camera and the top of the whiteboard; and
setting a tilt angle of the image sensor with the vertical axis to be approximately parallel with respect to the plane of the whiteboard;
computing the focal length of the single view camera using the input parameters of the whiteboard and the set tilt angle so as to capture an in focus, uniform resolution image of the whiteboard.”

D. The 35 USC 103 Rejection of Claims 2, 4, 7, 16, 17, 19-21, 26 and 27.

Claims 2, 4, 7, 16, 17, 19-21, 26 and 27 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shigehiro in view of Rodriguez Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 6,179,426), herein after Rodriguez. The Examiner contended that though Shigehiro does teach that the view camera is adjusted on the boom so as to capture the desired portion(s) of the whiteboard, Shigehiro does not teach that the view camera is adjusted on the boom so that the camera's depth of field covers the desired portion(s) of the whiteboard, the tilt angle of the camera's sensing surface is approximately parallel to the plane of the whiteboard, and the distance between the center of projection of the camera and the camera's sensing surface is adjusted to provide optimum focus. The Examiner further contended, however, that Rodriguez teaches these features found in the applicant's dependent claims. The applicants respectfully traverse this contention of obviousness.

The applicants have amended Claims 1, 23 and 25 to include the limitations of allowed claim 22. Claim 15 was amended to include the limitations of allowable Claim 18. Claim 11 was amended to correct a minor typographical error. These changes were made to speed prosecution. No admission is made that the original claims were anticipated or obvious in light of the cited art. It is believed that this amendment overcomes the cited rejection of Claims 2, 4, 7, 16, 17, 19-21, 26 and 27 over Shigehiro in view of Rodriguez. As such, it is respectfully requested that Claims 2, 4, 7, 16, 17, 19-21, 26 and 27 be allowed based on the non-obvious quoted claim language:

"wherein the in focus uniform resolution image of said entire whiteboard is captured by
inputting the parameters of the whiteboard comprising whiteboard width, whiteboard height, the height of the whiteboard as imaged by the single view camera, the horizontal distance between the whiteboard and the center of projection of the single view camera, the height of the image sensor, and vertical distance between the center of projection of the single view camera and the top of the whiteboard; and

setting a tilt angle of the image sensor with the vertical axis to be approximately parallel with respect to the plane of the whiteboard;
computing the focal length of the single view camera using the input parameters of the whiteboard and the set tilt angle so as to capture an in focus, uniform resolution image of the whiteboard.”

E. The 35 USC 103 Rejection of Claims 5-6, 11-14, 23 and 24 .

Claims 5-6, 11-14, 23 and 24 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shigehiro in view of Keenan, U.S. Publication 2004/0201698, herein after referred to as Keenan. The Examiner contended that though Shigehiro does teach that the mounting device does enable the boom to be positioned above the whiteboard in FIGs 1 and 3, Shigehiro does not explicitly teach that the mounting device mounts on the surface the whiteboard is mounted to, that more than one type of interchangeable mounting devices exist, that image enhancements to the image can be made and that an in focus uniform resolution image of the entire whiteboard can be captured using a single camera. However, the Examiner contended that Keenan teaches these features. The applicants respectfully traverse this contention of obviousness.

The applicants have amended Claims 1 and 23 (the claims from which Claims 5-6, 11-14, and 24 ultimately depend) to include the limitations of allowed claim 22. Claim 11 was amended to correct a minor typographical error. These changes were made to speed prosecution. No admission is made that the original claims were anticipated or obvious in light of the cited art. It is believed that this amendment overcomes the cited rejection of Claims 5-6, 11-14, 23 and 24 over Shigehiro in view of Keenan. As such, it is respectfully requested these be allowed based on the aforementioned non-obvious quoted claim language.

F. The 35 USC 103 Rejection of Claims 8, 9 and 10.

Claims 8, 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shigehiro in view of Rodriguez Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 6,179,426), in further view of Addeo et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,335, 011, herein after Addeo. The Examiner contended that though Keenan and Rodriguez teach the limitations of Claim 7, they do not disclose that the microphone device is a microphone array. The Examiner contends that Addeo teaches this limitation, however. The applicants respectfully traverse this contention of obviousness.

The applicants have amended Claim 1 (the claim from which Claims 8, 9 and 10 ultimately depend) to include the limitations of allowed Claim 22. These change was made to speed prosecution. No admission is made that the original claims were anticipated or obvious in light of the cited art. It is believed that this amendment overcomes the cited rejection of Claims 8, 9 and 10 over Shigehiro in view of Keenan. As such, it is respectfully requested these be allowed based on the aforementioned non-obvious quoted claim language.

G. The 35 USC 103 Rejection of Claim 28.

Claim 28 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shigehiro in view of Rodriguez Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 6,179,426), in further view of Branc et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,122,865, herein after Branc. The Examiner contended that though Shigehiro and Rodriguez teach the limitations of Claim 27 they do not teach the view camera is mounted on a wall and positioned so as to have a view of the whiteboard. However, Branc discloses this feature. The applicants respectfully traverse this contention of obviousness.

The applicants have amended Claim 25 (the claim from with Claim 28 ultimately depends) to include the limitations of allowed Claim 22. This change was made to speed prosecution. No admission is made that the original claim was anticipated or

obvious in light of the cited art. It is believed that this amendment overcomes the cited rejection of Claim 28 over Shigehiro in view of Rodrigues, in further view of Branc. As such, it is respectfully requested these be allowed based on the aforementioned non-obvious quoted claim language.

In summary, it is believed that the claims 1-29 are in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims at an early date is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Katrina A. Lyon', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Katrina A. Lyon

Registration No. 42,821

Attorney for Applicants

LYON & HARR, LLP
300 Esplanade Drive, Suite 800
Oxnard, CA 93036
(805) 278-8855